

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 07592 291609Z

56

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 050781

P R 291506Z SEP 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3184

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 7592

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 19, 1976  
(SALT TWO - 1096)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON  
AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 29, 1976.

QUOTE:

MR. MINISTER:

TODAY I WANT TO RETURN TO THE U.S. DATA BASE  
PROPOSAL WHICH THE UNITED STATES CONSIDERS ESSENTIAL.  
THE CARRYING OUT OF THIS PROPOSAL WOULD NOT ONLY INSURE  
THAT BOTH SIDES SHARE A COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF THE  
PROVISIONS OF THE NEW AGREEMENT AND APPLY THESE PROVISIONS  
IN A UNIFORM MANNER BUT WOULD ALSO FACILITATE REACHING  
AGREEMENT ON THESE PROVISIONS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 07592 291609Z

IT IS A BASIC GOAL OF BOTH SIDES IN ARRIVING AT AN

AGREEMENT THAT THERE BE A CLEAR AND AGREED UNDERSTANDING OF ITS PROVISIONS AND ASSURANCE THAT THESE PROVISIONS WILL BE APPLIED UNIFORMLY. TO THIS END, THE UNITED STATES HAS MADE A PROPOSAL WHEREBY THERE WOULD BE AGREEMENT ON THE NUMBER OF ARMS BY CATEGORY POSSESSED BY EACH SIDE AS OF THE DATE OF SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT. CHANGES TO THESE NUMBERS WOULD BE REPORTED TWICE A YEAR IN THE STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION.

IF, AS A RESULT OF EXCHANGES OF DATA, THE TWO SIDES AGREE ON THE NUMBER OF ARMS BY CATEGORY DEPLOYED BY EACH SIDE, THEN THEY COULD BE ASSURED THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT ARE BEING APPLIED UNIFORMLY. IF, HOWEVER, THE SIDES DO NOT AGREE, THEY WOULD BECOME AWARE THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT ARE NOT BEING APPLIED UNIFORMLY. IN THE LATTER CASE THE EXCHANGE OF DATA WOULD NOT ONLY INDICATE THAT A DISCREPANCY EXISTS, BUT IT WOULD ALSO ASSIST IN RESOLVING THE DISCREPANCY. FOR EXAMPLE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE UNITED STATES PROPOSAL REGARDING THE NUMBER OF ICBM LAUNCHERS OF MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS, EXCHANGES OF DATA AND AGREEMENT ON THE NUMBER OF MIRVED ICBM LAUNCHERS COUNTED BY EACH SIDE COULD EITHER CONFIRM THAT BOTH SIDES INTERPRET THE COUNTING PROVISIONS IN THE SAME MANNER OR IT WILL INDICATE WHAT DIFFERENCES OF INTERPRETATIONS EXIST AND THEIR MAGNITUDE.

AS AN ADDITIONAL BENEFIT, THE EXCHANGE OF DATA REQUIRED IN ORDER TO REACH AGREEMENT ON A DATA BASE WOULD ALSO CONTRIBUTE IN A PRACTICAL WAY TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRECISE AND UNAMBIGUOUS DEFINITIONS OF ARMS TO BE LIMITED. THE PROBLEM OF ARRIVING AT A MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY DEFINITION OF A HEAVY BOMBER IS AN EXAMPLE WHEREIN SUCH AN EXCHANGE WOULD BE USEFUL. IF EACH SIDE WERE TO IDENTIFY THE NUMBER OF HEAVY BOMBERS IT CURRENTLY POSSESSES BASED ON ITS OWN HEAVY BOMBER DEFINITION, THE OTHER SIDE WOULD KNOW THE EXTENT OF EXISTING DIFFERENCES, IF ANY, AND THIS COULD FACILITATE RESOLUTION OF THIS ISSUE.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 07592 291609Z

MR. MINISTER, THE ABOVE EXAMPLES ARE NOT HYPOTHETICAL, BUT RATHER APPLY TO REAL DIFFERENCES EXISTING BETWEEN US. THE UNITED STATES DATA BASE PROPOSAL OFFERS A PRACTICAL MEANS FOR ASSISTING IN THE RESOLUTION OF THESE DIFFERENCES. INITIAL DATA EXCHANGES COULD BE CONDUCTED INFORMALLY BETWEEN THE DELEGATIONS BASED UPON EACH SIDE'S CURRENT FORMULATION OF THE PROVISIONS. THIS WOULD FACILITATE ARRIVING AT A MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY RESOLUTION PRIOR

TO THE TIME OF SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT OF ANY ISSUES THAT EXAMINATION OF THE DATA MIGHT RAISE. FURTHER, IF THE SIDES ARE IN ACCORD ON THE NUMBER OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS IN EACH CATEGORY POSSESSED BY EACH SIDE AS OF THE TIME OF SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT, THERE WILL BE NO QUESTION AS TO HOW MANY ARMS, IF ANY, MUST BE DISMANTLED OR DESTROYED IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT.

MR. MINISTER, I AGAIN WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT IF AGREEMENT CAN BE REACHED ON THE UNITED STATES DATA BASE PROPOSAL, THE UNITED STATES WOULD BE PREPARED TO AGREE THAT DISMANTLING AND DESTRUCTION OF EXCESS ARMS BEGIN NOT LATER THAN THE EXPIRATION OF THE INTERIM AGREEMENT AND BE COMPLETED WITHIN CERTAIN SPECIFIC PERIODS OF TIME AFTER THAT DATE. FURTHER, IF AGREEMENT ON THE DATA BASE PROPOSAL WERE REACHED, PARAGRAPHS 2(A) AND 2(I) OF ARTICLE XVII AS WELL AS THE OBLIGATION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION COULD BE DELETED.

MR. MINISTER, THE SOVIET DELEGATION HAS IN THE PAST MAINTAINED THAT THE UNITED STATES DATA BASE PROPOSAL CALLS INTO QUESTION VERIFICATION BY NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS OF COMPLIANCE WITH NEW AGREEMENT. I AGAIN WANT TO STRESS THAT OUR DATA BASE PROPOSAL IN NO WAY WEAKENS OR CALLS INTO QUESTION THE PRINCIPLE OF VERIFICATION BY NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS. RATHER, IN ORDER TO INSURE THAT PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT ARE APPLIED IN A UNIFORM MANNER BY BOTH SIDES, THE UNITED STATES MAINTAINS THAT THERE MUST BE A CLEAR AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE CATEGORIES AND THE NUMBERS IN EACH OF THESE CATEGORIES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE LIMITATIONS. SUCH AGREEMENT ON CATEGORIES AND NUMBERS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 07592 291609Z

WOULD INSURE A UNIFORM APPLICATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT.

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE DELEGATIONS ON THIS SUBJECT, I WANT TO OUTLINE THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE SIDES COULD INITIATE THE DATA BASE CONCEPT:

(A) INFORMAL ACCORD ON CATEGORIES OF ARMS UPON WHICH DATA WILL BE EXCHANGED.

(B) INFORMAL EXCHANGE OF DATA RELATING TO NUMBERS OF ARMS IN EACH CATEGORY PRIOR TO SIGNING THE AGREEMENT BASED ON EACH SIDE'S UNDERSTANDING OF RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE JOINT DRAFT TEXT.

(C) ANALYSIS BY EACH SIDE OF THE DATA PROVIDED BY  
THE OTHER SIDE AND RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES, IF ANY,  
WHICH MIGHT ARISE AS A RESULT OF THESE EXCHANGES.

(D) FORMAL EXCHANGE OF AGREED DATA AT THE TIME OF  
SIGNATURE OF THE NEW AGREEMENT.

MR. MINISTER, I HOPE THAT THIS ELABORATION OF THE  
DATA BASE PROPOSAL WILL ASSIST IN YOUR CONSIDERATION OF  
IT. UNQUOTE. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** TEXT, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), SPEECHES  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 29 SEP 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** saccheem  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976SALTT07592  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D760367-1019  
**From:** SALT TALKS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t1976097/aaaaafpa.tel  
**Line Count:** 180  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** saccheem  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 12 MAY 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <12 MAY 2004 by greeneet>; APPROVED <09 SEP 2004 by saccheem>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 19, 1976 (SALT TWO - 1096) THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR  
**TAGS:** PARM, US, UR, (JOHNSON, U ALEXIS)  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006